

Chapter 6 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
FOR THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE
GENERAL PLAN, MAGNOLIA AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN, ZONING
CODE, SUBDIVISION CODE, AND CITYWIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES
FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**I.
INTRODUCTION**

The Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final Program EIR) prepared for this project addressed the potential environmental effects associated with the adoption and long-term implementation of the City of Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code), Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code), and Citywide Design Guidelines. The adoption and implementation of General Plan elements, comprehensive updates of the Zoning and Subdivision Codes, Design Guidelines, and Specific Plan individually and cumulatively constitute a project and require analysis of the environmental effects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Final Program EIR will be used by the City and other responsible and local agencies to provide information necessary for environmental review of discretionary actions related to adoption of the Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines.

**II.
DEFINITIONS**

“Applicant” means the City of Riverside.

“Approved Project” or “Project” means either individually or cumulatively, or any combination of the components thereof, the City of Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines, as described in the Draft Program EIR and the Final Program EIR.

“CEQA” means the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.1.

“CEQA Guidelines” means the State of California Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Code Regulations Title 14 Sections 15000 to 15387.

“City” means the City of Riverside, California.

“City Planning Commission” means the Planning Commission of the City of Riverside.

“CNEL” means the Community Noise Equivalent Level.

“CO” means carbon monoxide.

“County” means the County of Riverside.

“Council” means the City of Riverside City Council.

“dB(A)” means decibels on the “A”-weighted scale.

“Draft Program EIR” means the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines dated November, 2004.

“EIR” means an environmental impact report.

“Final Program EIR” means the Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines dated February, 2005.

“Local CEQA Guidelines” means the City of Riverside’s CEQA Guidelines Resolution 19478, as amended.

“Local Agency” means any public agency other than a state agency, board, or commission. Local agency includes but is not limited to cities, counties, charter cities and counties, districts, school districts, special districts, redevelopment agencies, local agency formation commissions, and any board, commission, or organization subdivision of a local agency when so designated by order or resolution of the governing legislative body of the local agency.

“LOS” means level of service.

“MMRP” means the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

“MSHCP” means Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

“MWD” means the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

“NO_x” means oxides of nitrogen.

“NPDES” means the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

“PM_{2.5}” means particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter, or respirable particulate matter.

“PM₁₀” means particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter, or respirable particulate matter.

“Project” means the General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines for the City of Riverside, as described in the Draft Program EIR and the Final Program EIR.

“RHNA” means Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

“ROG” means reactive organic gases.

“SCAG” means the Southern California Association of Governments.

“SCAQMD” means the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

“SUSMP” means the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.

“State” means the State of California.

“V/C” means volume-to-capacity ratio.

“WMWD” means Western Municipal Water District.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is the adoption and implementation of the following programmatic documents:

1. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside General Plan
2. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code of the City of Riverside) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names
3. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code of the City of Riverside)
4. Adoption of Citywide Design Guidelines
5. The Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan

The City of Riverside is the largest city within Southern California’s Inland Empire. Over the next 20 years, both the City and the Inland Empire as a whole are anticipating substantial population growth. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects that the population of western Riverside County (stretching from Corona to Banning and including unincorporated areas) will increase from just over 1.4 million in 2005 to 2.2 million in 2025. During the same period, SCAG projects that the City of Riverside’s population will increase from about 280,000 to about 353,397.

Faced with these significant growth projections, the City of Riverside began in 2001 a series of activities to shape a new community vision, in part intended to ensure that future growth could be achieved while maintaining and enhancing the community’s major assets and distinctive qualities.

Numerous community involvement activities led to the adoption of a report in 2002 entitled *Visioning Riverside*, which set forth a vision of Riverside to be developed over the next two decades. To implement the many facets of this vision, the City of Riverside initiated a major update of its General Plan and those regulatory and related documents used to implement the General Plan. As described above, this program includes comprehensive updates of the General Plan, comprehensive revisions to the Zoning and Subdivision Codes, preparation of a Specific Plan for the Magnolia Avenue Corridor, and preparation of new Citywide Design Guidelines.

A General Plan is a community’s planning “constitution” and the primary document for guiding land use and development decisions within the City. California law requires every jurisdiction to adopt a general plan that addresses, at minimum, seven major land use and development issues typically most relevant to all California cities and counties. These seven issues – land use, circulation,

housing, conservation, open space, noise and public safety – are addressed in different chapters of the General Plan commonly known as “elements.”

Riverside’s General Plan distills the City’s vision into specific objectives, policies, and implementation actions that will guide the physical development of the City of Riverside and its sphere of influence – together referred to as the Planning Area – through the year 2025. Section 65303 of the Government Code also allows a jurisdiction to adopt any other elements to the General Plan or address any other subjects that related to unique characteristics of that jurisdiction. The General Plan encompasses all properties within the City of Riverside, as well as lands within the City’s sphere of influence.

The Zoning Code is the primary tool for implementing land use plans and policies contained in the General Plan and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, as well as for implementing specific plans applicable to other areas of the City. This Project involves a comprehensive revision of the Zoning Code to reflect current City land-use policy, to simplify procedures, and to make the Code easier to use. The Zoning Code divides the City into zones and establishes regulations for each zone with respect to permitted uses, allowable density, building height, development character, etc. The Zoning Code has been revised to implement the objectives and policies established in the General Plan, particularly with regard to land use categories. Zones have been renamed, combined, and eliminated to achieve a clear correspondence to General Plan land use categories. The provisions of the Zoning Code have been revised to streamline review of development and land use applications, and to clarify review and approval responsibilities.

Similarly, the Subdivision Code has been comprehensively updated to reflect the City’s development goals, and to streamline and clarify the review and approval processes for land divisions.

Discretionary Actions

The Program EIR serves as the basis for environmental review and impact mitigation for the adoption and implementation of the General Plan update and supporting documents. The City will review subsequent projects for consistency with the Program EIR and prepare appropriate environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA provisions for Program EIRs and subsequent projects.

The Program EIR incorporates discretionary actions which will or may in the future be taken by decision makers in approving this Project. Subsequent projects under the Program EIR may include, but are not limited to, the following implementation activities:

- Rezoning of properties
- Approval of Specific Plans
- Approval of development plans, tentative maps, variances, conditional use permits, and other land use permits and discretionary projects
- Approval of development agreements
- Approval of facility and service master plans and financing plans
- Approval and funding of public improvement projects
- Approval of resource management plans
- Approval of public works projects
- Issuance of municipal bonds
- Issuance of permits and other approvals necessary for implementation of the General Plan

- Acquisition of property by purchase or eminent domain

The following lead, responsible, and trustee agencies may use this Program EIR in the adoption of the General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines, and approval of subsequent implementation activities. These agencies may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- City of Riverside
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- United States Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Conservation
- California Department of Housing and Community Development
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- State Lands Commission
- California Water Resources Control Board
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- County of Riverside
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
- Riverside Unified School District
- Alvord Unified School District
- Riverside Highland Water Company
- Eastern Municipal Water District
- Western Municipal Water District
- Southern California Association of Governments
- University of California
- Western Riverside Council of Governments

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project
- The Draft Program EIR
- The Final Program EIR
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft Program EIR
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the City with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft Program EIR
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- All findings, resolutions and ordinances adopted by the Council decision makers in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein
- All final reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies

with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's actions on the Project

- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the public hearing
- Minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations
- The Notice of Determination
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Section 21167.6(e) of CEQA

The custodians of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is the City Clerk and the Planning Director, whose offices are located at Riverside City Hall, 3900 Main Street, Riverside, California 92522. The documents discussed herein are also available for public inspection at the Planning Department at City Hall. Copies of all these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based, are and at all relevant times have been available upon request at the offices of the City, the custodian for such documents or other materials.

The City Council has relied upon all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project, even if not every document was formally presented to the Council or City Staff as part of the City files generated in connection with the Project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. First, many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions of which the Council was aware in approving the Project. (See City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392, 142 Cal.Rptr. 873 [1978]; Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration, 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, n.6, 252 Cal.Rptr. 620 [1988].) Second, other of the documents influenced the expert advice provided to City Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the City. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the City's decisions relating to the adoption of the Project. (See Public Resources Code Section 21167.6[e][10]; Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose, 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866, 226 Cal.Rptr. 575 [1986]; Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus, 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155, 39 Cal.Rptr.2d 54 [1985].)

The Final Program EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA and reflects the City Council's independent judgment. The City Council believes that its decision on the Project is one which must be made after a hearing required by the City. As a result, any judicial review of the City's decision will be governed by Section 21168.5 of CEQA and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085. Regardless of the standard of review which is applicable, the City Council has considered evidence and arguments presented to the City prior to or at the public hearings on this matter. In determining whether the Project has a significant impact on the environment, and in adopting Findings pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, the City Council has complied with CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2.

V. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Section 21002 of CEQA provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” (Public Resources Code Section 21002 [emphasis added]). The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Section 21002 goes on to state that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects.” *Id.*

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Public Resources Code Section 21081[a].) As stated in Public Resources Code Section 21091(a), the public agency must make one or more of the following findings with respect to each identified significant effect: (1) Changes of alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment; (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can be and should be, adopted by that other agency; and/or (3) Specific economic, legal, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego*, 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417, 183 Cal.Rptr. 898 [1982].) “(F) easibility under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, social and technological factors.” (*Id.*; see also *Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Ass’n v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715, 29 Cal.Rptr.2d 182 [1993].)

VI. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

CEQA requires the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with project implementation. A MMRP has been defined and serves that function for this Final Program EIR.

The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation. The City will serve as the overall MMRP Coordinator.

A MMRP has been prepared for the Project and will be adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Res. Code Section 21081.6[a][1].) The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

VII. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The following paragraphs describe impacts determined to be less than significant, either directly or cumulatively, in the preparation of the Draft Program EIR and the Final Program EIR. The City Council hereby makes this same determination based on the conclusions in the Final Program EIR.

Agricultural Resources

- Both the General Plan and the Zoning Code retain the Agricultural land use designation/zoning district; no land previously designated for exclusive agriculture has been redesignated for another use. The General Plan, Zoning Code, and Subdivision Code have incorporated the provisions of Proposition R and Measure C (Final EIR, p. 5.2-5).
- To prevent indirect impacts on agricultural areas, the Project includes objectives and policies intended to retain, protect, and encourage agricultural use. The objectives and policies listed in Section 5.2 of the Program EIR enable the preservation and protection of agricultural land through assistance programs, development of agricultural zoning districts, transfer of development rights and leases to UCR, development of suitable buffers around agricultural uses to prevent incompatible land uses adjacent to agricultural uses, and water subsidies. Impact is less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.2-5).

Air Quality

- The Project includes an Air Quality Element that proactively addresses regional air quality in a manner consistent with policies and measures outlined in the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to achieve Federal and State standards for healthful air quality in the South Coast Air Basin. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP but will facilitate AQMP implementation. No impact with respect to this issue is anticipated to occur (Final EIR, p. 5.3-16).

Biological Resources

- To implement General Plan objectives and policies, the Zoning Code includes zones that apply to large, publicly owned open space areas, such as Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, to ensure preservation of these resources. The City's participation in the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, or MSHCP, will also contribute to the protection of identified critical resource areas within the Planning Area (Final EIR, p. 5.4-26).

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- With adherence to and implementation of the goals and policies described in Section 5.5 of the Program EIR, and continued application of Title 20 of the City's Municipal Code, impact on

cultural and paleontological resources will be less than significant at the programmatic level. Consistent with current City practices and CEQA requirements, potential impact on cultural and paleontological resources resulting from future individual development projects will be assessed on a project-by-project basis. If project-level impacts are identified, project-specific mitigation measures will be required per CEQA (Final EIR, p. 5.5-18).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- The current regulatory environment provides a high level of protection from the hazardous materials manufactured within, transported to, and stored in industrial and educational facilities within the Planning Area (Final EIR, p. 5.7-12). The combined effect of Project policies and ongoing City practices will reduce programmatic-level hazardous materials impact to a less than significant level (Final EIR, p. 5.7-13).
- Implementation of the Project policies described in Section 5.7 of the Program EIR and continuation of existing practices unrelated to the Project will reduce the potential impact of wildland fire hazards, air safety, and emergency response to a less than significant level (Final EIR, p. 5.7-18 and 5.7-20).

Hydrology/Water Quality

- According to the Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) Urban Water Master Plan (UWMP), projected domestic water demand is expected to increase from 77,626 acre-feet per year in 2000 to 94,886 acre-feet per year in 2020. The projected water demand (94,886 acre-feet) is well below the water supply anticipated to be available to the RPU in that year (128,600 acre-feet). The RPU and Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) Urban Water Management Plans project that adequate water supplies will be available within the Planning Area through the year 2020. The Project does not anticipate nor provide for significant future development of areas served by WMWD; thus, water supply impacts will be less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.8-8).
- Project implementation will not place housing or other structures within any 100-year flood hazard area; in fact, the Project discourages development of sensitive facilities in these areas. In general, flood-prone areas are designated for open space and recreational uses rather than sensitive or habitable facilities. The City will review all development proposals to assess if a project is proposed within a flood hazard area. Residents of the City will not be exposed to any significant risk involving flooding from dam or levee failure due to implementation of the Project, since the majority of the new development proposed by the 2004 General Plan will occur as infill growth outside of known flood hazard areas (Final EIR, p. 5.8-10).

Land Use and Planning

- Key project objectives include establishing compatible interface between land uses over the long term. The Project will not physically divide an established community, conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project. Impact is less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.9-14).
- Objectives and policies in the Land Use and Urban Design Element and Conservation Element support the goals of the Western Riverside County MSHCP and plans for the Santa Ana River. Project impact related to consistency with the Western Riverside County MSHCP is less than significant. (Final EIR, p. 5.9-19)

Mineral Resources

- Only one State-classified mineral resource zone (MRZ-2) area exists within the Planning Area. The three General Plan designations that apply to the MRZ-2 land are Open Space/Natural Resources, Public Parks, and Public Facilities/Institutional. Both the Open Space/Natural Resource and Public Parks designations are fully compatible with the MRZ-2 area and no impact will result. Although the Public Facilities/Institutional designation is potentially incompatible with the MRZ-2 area according to the City's Municipal Code, specific sites for any public/semipublic uses on this site will be subject to discretionary approval. This land use designation is carried over from the City's 1994 General Plan; it is not a new feature of the Project. In any event, the surrounding area has been highly urbanized for nearly a century; further mining in this area is not considered reasonably foreseeable. In sum, the impact on mineral resources is less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.10-3 and 5.10-4).

Noise – Airport/Land Use Compatibility

- The Land Use Policy Map (Figure 3-3 in Section 3.0 [Project Description]) will restrict intensive new uses within airport-influenced areas, as will regulations in the Zoning Code. Development controls include limiting development within areas subject to high noise levels and limiting the intensity and height of development within aircraft hazard zones. These controls are consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, which designates zones of airport-influenced areas for every airport in Riverside County and provided a series of policies and compatibility criteria to ensure that both aviation uses and surrounding areas may continue. Compliance with the objectives and policies established by the General Plan, as well as the Airport (AIR), Airport Protection Overlay (AP), and Air Industrial (AI) zones of the Zoning Code, will reduce impact to less than significant levels. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not result in significant impact related to airport/land use compatibility at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.11-32 and 5.11-37).

Population and Housing

- The General Plan encourages infill development and revitalization of both vacant and underutilized sites within the Planning Area. Infill development on vacant sites will not displace residents and/or businesses. However, revitalization of underutilized sites could displace residents and businesses over time. The displacement impact will not be permanent and therefore not significant, as reuse of sites will consist of development at higher residential densities or will include housing in mixed-use developments. Overall, land use policy allows for an increase in approximately 16,000 units over the life of the General Plan. As noted by Policy LU-8.4, the Project encourages a mix of both residential and non-residential uses as a means of revitalizing many underutilized parcels, and the General Plan includes three new Mixed-Use land use designations to implement this policy. At a programmatic level, the Project's displacement impact will be less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.12-5).

Public Services

- New development will place increased demand on public services. However, the incremental and gradual rate of growth and the payment of development fees and property taxes will mitigate impact to a level considered less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.13-19).

- Adherence to project policies and City standards/practices listed in Section 5.13 of the Program EIR will reduce impacts on community centers below a level of significance at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.13-26).

Recreation

- Project policies, and specifically policies in the Park and Recreation Element, will work to preserve existing park space and recreational resources, will provide for the expansion of City facilities, and will allow for the development of additional park space and recreation centers. Over the long term, the City will achieve its objectives, and impact will be less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.14-15).
- Collectively, the combination of Project features, City standards and practices, the use of large open space areas for recreational facilities, and the proximity of County park and recreational facilities will provide ample recreational opportunities for Riverside residents such that Project-related population growth will lead to increases in park usage, but not foreseeable intense use to the degree that significant deterioration can be anticipated. Impact is less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.14-16).

Utilities and Service Systems

- With adherence to and implementation of the General Plan objectives and policies, along with continued adherence to the noted standards and practices, impact on storm drainage facilities will be less than significant at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.16-6).
- The specific environmental impact of constructing any storm water and drainage facilities cannot be determined at this programmatic level of analysis because no specific development projects are proposed; however, all development pursuant to the Project, including storm water and drainage facilities, will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine potential level of impact and consistency with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) at the time such specific projects are proposed (Final EIR, p. 5.16-6).
- Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies supporting water conservation, implementation of CEQA on a project-by-project basis, and the requirement for a water supply assessment from water purveyors for future development projects pursuant to SB610 will ensure a less than significant impact on water supply at the programmatic level (Final EIR, page 5.16-24).
- Projected sewage treatment needs within the Planning Area in the year 2025 will not exceed the capacity of the Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant, which will have a remaining capacity of approximately nine million gallons per day (mgd) at project buildout. The City, which operates the treatment plant, estimates that Plant capacity is sufficient to serve the City's wastewater service needs through 2025 (Final EIR, p. 5.16-30).
- The level of new development allowed consistent with Project land use policy may require improvements to energy production, transmission, and distribution facilities. Utility providers anticipate that, due to the long-term nature of the Project and providers' abilities to plan for future needs based on General Plan projections, they can ensure adequate production, transmission, and distribution facilities as growth occurs (Final EIR, p. 5.16-38).

- The Planning Area is served by regional landfills with sufficient capacity to meet long-term solid waste disposal needs within the Planning Area; therefore, the impact on regional landfills is less than significant. Continued implementation of the City's many waste reduction and recycling programs, as well as adherence to and implantation of the policies and practices in the General Plan, will ensure that impacts related to the City's continued compliance with Public Resources Code Section 41780 (AB939) will be less than significant (Final EIR, p. 5.16-45).
- With adherence to and implementation of the Project policies and practices, the impact on telecommunications infrastructure will be less than significant at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.16-48).
- The specific environmental impact of constructing telecommunications infrastructure cannot be determined at the programmatic level of analysis in the Program EIR because no specific projects are proposed. However, the development and operation of any public facilities or infrastructure project, including telecommunications infrastructure, will be evaluated and addressed on a case-by-case basis when specific projects are proposed (Final EIR, p. 5.16-48).

VIII. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CAN BE MITIGATED, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND FINDINGS OF FACT

The following Findings for Project Impacts refer to the significant environmental effects of the project. Mitigation measures have been identified in the Final Program EIR which will avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects to below a level of significance.

A. AESTHETICS

Significant Project Impact (Visual Character and Scenic Resources): Development consistent with Project implementation will facilitate new development throughout the Planning Area that could potentially have adverse impacts on the City's visual character and scenic resources.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. The mitigation measures incorporated into the Project reduce visual character and scenic resource impacts to below a level of significance.

Facts in Support of Finding: The General Plan includes numerous policies that address the protection and enhancement of scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character of neighborhoods and business districts (FEIR, pp. 5.1-3 to 5.1-9). Implementation of these measures will occur through the continued application of City standards and practices, application of standards contained in the Zoning and Subdivision Codes, application of specific design requirements set forth in the Citywide Design Guidelines, and individual project review for consistency with the General Plan and applicable regulatory documents. This will reduce visual

character/scenic resource impacts to less than significant at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.1-10).

Significant Project Impact (Light and Glare): Riverside is largely urbanized and has substantial existing sources of light and glare; however, development within the Planning Area has the potential to create new sources of light, such as the introduction of headlights from additional traffic and new nighttime lighting of buildings. In addition, new structures could be a significant source of localized glare if they incorporate reflective building materials. Depending upon the location and scope of individual development projects, the impact on surrounding uses could be significant.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. The mitigation measures incorporated into the Project reduce light and glare impacts to below a level of significance.

Facts in Support of Finding: The General Plan includes numerous policies that address light and glare effects (FEIR, p. 5.1-9). Implementation of these measures will occur through the continued application of City standards and practices, application of standards contained in the Zoning and Subdivision Codes, application of specific design requirements set forth in the Citywide Design Guidelines, and individual project review for consistency with the General Plan and applicable regulatory documents. This will reduce light and glare impacts to less than significant at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.1-10).

B. GEOLOGY/SOILS

Significant Project Impact (Soil Erosion): Implementation of the Project will result in additional structures and people within the Planning Area that will be potentially exposed to geologic and/or soils/erosion hazards. During the construction phase of subsequent development projects, grading could temporarily expose soil surfaces to erosion through storm water runoff and wind. Long-term soil loss could also occur from the increased peak flows and additional runoff produced by paved or landscaped surfaces within the Planning Area. Uncontrolled flows could result in scouring or downcutting of stream channels where runoff velocities and volumes are high. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. The mitigation measures incorporated into the Project reduce soil erosion impacts to below a level of significance.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project contains many policies and standards designed to minimize exposure of persons to geologic hazards and to guard against erosion (Final EIR, pp. 5-6-16 to 5-6-17). With adherence to and implementation of the General Plan policies and mitigation measures and continued application of standard development practices, potential geologic impacts will be reduced below a level of significance at the programmatic level. The following mitigation measures are feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon any development entitlement through these Findings:

GS-1 Geologic and/or geotechnical studies shall be required for proposed new development projects located in areas identified as susceptible to erosion; binding mitigation strategies

must be adopted. These areas are generally identified on **Figures 5-7 and 5-9** and include areas with high soil limitations as indicated in Table 5.6-1. In addition, the City may require individual development applicants to incorporate measures to stabilize and maintain slopes on a site-by-site basis (Final EIR, p. 5.6-17).

- GS-2 Continually update development standards and adopt the latest building construction codes to guide future development in areas with known geologic and seismic-related hazards (Final EIR, p. 5.6-17).

The mitigation measures will reduce soil erosion impacts to a less than significant level.

C. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

Significant Project Impact: Over the long term, individual development projects will contribute cumulatively to increased runoff that could transport pollutants. General Plan policies and regulatory standards will ensure that the City require every applicable development project to comply with State Water Quality Control Board and City stormwater regulations, including compliance with NPDES requirements related to construction and operation measures to prevent erosion, siltation, and transport of urban pollutants (Final EIR, pp. 5.8-7 to 5.8-8).

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. Mitigation measures are required to ensure the highest level of protection to water quality. Impacts will be below a level of significance at the programmatic level.

Facts in Support of Finding: With adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as well as continued application of standard Federal, State and City regulations, the impact to surface hydrology will be less than significant at the programmatic level. The following mitigation measures are required to ensure such compliance are feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon any development entitlement through these Findings:

- HW-1 Prior to making land use decisions, the City will require project applicants to utilize available methods to estimate increases in pollutant loads and flows resulting from future development subject to NPDES regulations. In addition, project applicants shall demonstrate accomplishment of the following NPDES objectives:

- Use of structural and non-structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) to mitigate projected increases in pollutant loads and flows
- Minimized pollutant loading flow velocity during and after construction
- Minimized amounts of impervious surfaces and directly connected impervious surfaces
- Maximized on-site infiltration and runoff and temporary on-site retention areas
- Limited disturbance of natural water bodies and natural drainage systems
- Pollution prevention methods, source controls and treatment using small collection strategies located at or as close as possible to the source (Final EIR 5.8-11).

D. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Significant Project Impact (Conflicts with Redevelopment Plans): The General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Element describes and maps the City's redevelopment project areas. Authority conferred upon the City's Redevelopment Agency by State redevelopment law will be an important tool in achieving many of the General Plan's objectives. However, the Project proposes land use changes within redevelopment areas. Within the Arlington Project Area, the General Plan proposes the new Mixed-Use-Village land use designation. The Downtown Specific Plan and the Mixed-Use-Neighborhood, Mixed-Use-Village, and General Commercial land use designations are proposed within the Magnolia Center Project Area. A small portion of the High Grove Project Area is designated for Industrial land use. Finally, Mixed-Use-Urban and Mixed-Use-Village land use designations are proposed within the University Corridor Project Area. Existing redevelopment project plans may not be consistent with these proposed land uses.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. The mitigation measures incorporated into the Project reduce redevelopment land use consistency impacts to below a level of significance.

Facts in Support of Finding: With adherence to and implementation of the mitigation measure, the Project's potential impacts related to project consistency with redevelopment plans will be reduced below a level of significance at the programmatic level. The following mitigation measure is feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon any development entitlement through these Findings:

LU-1 The City will review redevelopment plans and amend the plans as necessary to ensure consistency with General Plan policies and land use designations (Final EIR, p. 5.9-22).

E. PUBLIC SERVICES

Significant Project Impact (Police Services): Given the total projected population of 376,254 people at buildout within the Planning Area, the Riverside Police Department (RPD) will need additional officers to serve the community. With the increase in population and new development, additional police services, and new or expanded facilities, will be required to provide acceptable service levels. As portions of Riverside's sphere of influence are annexed to the City, demands upon the RPD will increase.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which avoid the significant environmental effect identified in the Final Program EIR. Impacts will be below a level of significance with mitigation measures incorporated.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential impacts related to police services can be avoided by implementation of the following mitigation measures. The following mitigation measures are feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon development entitlements through these Findings:

PS-1 As part of the annual budgeting process, the City will assess the need for additional sworn and non-sworn police officers to provide protection services consistent with established City

service levels and commensurate increases in population, and to provide adequate facilities to house those officers. Any and all facilities will be subject to CEQA review, with mitigation measure applied at the site-specific level to address impacts (Final EIR, p. 5.13-5).

- PS-2 The City will review development proposals for sensitivity to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. Design features will be required that employ adequate lighting for public areas (Final EIR, p. 5.13-5).

Significant Project Impact (Fire/Emergency Services): Given the total projected population of 376,254 people at buildout, the Riverside Fire Department (RFD) will need additional facilities and personnel in order to adequately serve the community. With the increase in population and new development, additional fire/emergency services, and new or expanded facilities will be required to provide acceptable service levels. As portions of Riverside's sphere of influence are annexed to the City, demands upon the RFD will increase. Impacts in this regard are thus potentially significant.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which avoid the significant environmental effect identified in the Final Program EIR. Impacts will be below a level of significance with mitigation measures incorporated.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential impacts related to emergency and fire services can be avoided by implementation of the following mitigation measure. The following mitigation measures are feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon development entitlements through these Findings:

- PS-3 As part of the annual budgeting process, the City will assess the need for additional fire service and emergency personnel to provide protection services consistent with established City service levels and commensurate increases in population. Funding for new Fire Department facilities has been approved through recent local approval of a bond measure. Other funding typically comes from the City's General Fund. Any and all facilities will be subject to CEQA review, with mitigation measure applied at the site-specific level to address impacts (Final EIR, p. 5.13-9).

IX.

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A. AIR QUALITY

Significant Project Impact (Short-Term Air Quality): Construction-related air quality impacts will occur continuously through 2025 as individual development projects are constructed. Construction activity will primarily generate airborne dust, carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). In addition, architectural coatings, exterior paints and asphalt may release volatile organic compounds (VOC). Because the Project only sets forth broad parameters for new development and does not identify specific development proposals, construction-related emissions of individual future developments cannot be quantified at this time. Assuming relatively robust economic conditions over the next 20 years, construction activity will be a constant throughout the Planning Area, but the rate of development cannot be anticipated.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not reduce short-term air quality impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no additional feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation is required to reduce PM₁₀ emissions. While individual development projects will be required to employ construction approaches that minimize pollutant emissions (e.g., watering for dust control, tuning of equipment, limiting truck traffic to non-peak hours), on a cumulative basis over the next 20 years pollutant emissions associated with construction activity will be significant. Short-term construction-related air quality impacts will be evaluated on a project-specific basis (Final EIR, p. 5.3-17). However, these mitigation measures would substantially reduce construction impacts:

AQ-1 In accordance with AQMD Rule 403, the City will require the following measures to be taken during the construction of all projects to reduce the amount of dust and other sources of PM₁₀:

- Dust suppression at construction site using surfactants and other chemical stabilizers
- Wheel washers for construction equipment
- The watering down of all construction areas (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25)

AQ-4 The City will adopt and implement a dust control ordinance for the purpose of establishing minimum requirements for construction and demolition activities and other specified sources in order to reduce man-made fugitive dust and the corresponding PM₁₀ emissions (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

AQ-6 The City will adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to manage paved and unpaved roads and parking lots so they produce the minimum practicable level of particulates (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

Potential short-term air quality impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of the mitigation measures. Nevertheless, these impacts will remain significant and unavoidable (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25).

Significant Project Impact (Long-Term Air Quality): Development pursuant to Project policies and regulatory standards will generate additional emissions over time from both stationary sources and vehicular trips. For all pollutant categories except PM₁₀, long-term pollutant emissions in 2025 are projected to decrease relative to existing year 2004 conditions. A possible explanation for PM₁₀ increasing through 2025 is a lack of specific legal control measures for this pollutant. PM₁₀ will continue to be emitted from diesel exhaust and tire wear, which are difficult to regulate. Levels of PM₁₀ have exceeded State standards regularly in the past and are expected to continue exceeding these standards in the future.

Therefore, long-term PM₁₀ air quality impacts resulting from implementation of the Project will be significant, and mitigation is required. Although individual projects will be reviewed pursuant to

CEQA, because Riverside is located within a non-attainment air basin, the potential impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not reduce long-term air quality impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no additional feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation is required to reduce PM₁₀ emissions. Policies within the General Plan Air Quality Element will facilitate continued City cooperation with SCAQMD and SCAG to achieve regional air quality improvement goals, encourage alternative transportation modes, implement transportation demand management strategies, and provide for development patterns that reduce overall vehicle trips. In addition to these policies, the following mitigation measures will further reduce PM₁₀ air quality impacts:

AQ-2 The City will continue to implement effective citywide street sweeping (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25).

AQ-3 The City will use Best Available Control Technology in the City's practices, including but not limited to advanced diesel particulate traps on all City vehicles and purchase and use of aqueous diesel fuel vehicles (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

AQ-5 The City will work to divert commercial truck traffic to off-peak periods to alleviate non-recurrent congestion as a means to improve roadway efficiency and reduce diesel emissions (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

AQ-6 The City will adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to manage paved and unpaved roads and parking lots so they produce the minimum practicable level of particulates (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

AQ-7 The City will collaborate with the EPA, SCAQMD and/or warehouse owners and operators to create regulations and programs to reduce the amount of diesel fumes released due to warehousing operation (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

Potential long-term air quality impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of the mitigation measures. Nevertheless, these impacts will remain significant and unavoidable (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25).

B. NOISE

Significant Project Impact (Future Noise): Development pursuant to land use policies will contribute to an increase in traffic noise along freeways and major arterials. The analysis in the Program Final EIR accounts for ambient regional traffic growth as well. Noise levels along roadway corridors and associated with airport operations will result in the continued exposure of some residential areas to noise levels inconsistent with the City's noise/land use compatibility criteria. Interior noise levels of future residential development projects in these areas will be required to be

reduced to at least 45 d(B)A, consistent with State Title 24 requirements. However, exterior sound levels cannot be mitigated (Final EIR, p. 5.11-32).

The potential exists that “conditionally acceptable” and “normally unacceptable” zones resulting from roadway, freeway, and/or railway traffic may overlay areas of proposed new development, meaning that new development could conflict with adopted noise/land use compatibility standards. The Final EIR has determined that land use compatibility impacts associated with these increased noise levels cannot be mitigated. The Project would be contributing to this significant and unavoidable noise impact (Final EIR, p. 5.11-20).

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not reduce exterior sounds impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project could facilitate development along regional freeways and major arterials where regionally generated traffic will be a substantial source of noise in the future. The degree to which Project features and policies, along with ongoing City standards and practices will achieve acceptable noise levels on a project-by-project basis cannot be measured. Although acceptable interior noise levels can be achieved with full compliance with Title 24 Noise Insulation Standard, compliance with acceptable exterior noise levels is less certain. While the City will require acoustical studies in potentially affected locations, imposition of these programmatic features is speculative and cannot predict precisely the degree to which exterior noise levels will be reduced. Impact will be significant and unavoidable at the programmatic level (Final EIR, p. 5.11-37).

C. PUBLIC SERVICES

Significant Project Impact (Library Services): Existing City library facilities do not meet current needs and service standards. The increase in population associated with Project land use policies will place increased demand on strained facilities and services, even with the planned new library branches and expansion of existing facilities. Even after implementation of and adherence to the policies and practices listed in Section 5.13, which includes continued collection of Measure C library parcel taxes, there is no certainty that an acceptable service standard for library services can be achieved, particularly since the collection of the library parcel tax will cease in 2012 unless extended by voters. The Project does not include any other features that will help the City achieve its service standard for libraries. In order for the City to achieve library service that is deemed “acceptable” by the City’s own measurement standards, the City will need to create additional library facilities above those already planned and ensure that facilities have sufficient volumes, hours of operation, staff and other features to ensure compliance with the City’s standards. Impact is significant and unavoidable.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which lessen the significant environmental effect identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not achieve long-term library impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section

21081(a)(3), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no feasible measures within the control of the City that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: The continued collection of funds through the library parcel tax will work to minimize impact. However, absent any extension of the tax beyond 2012 by voter approval, which is not within the City's ability to control, or absent any other levied fee which would also require voter approval, the City cannot be assured of meeting its established service standards. Another option would be for the City to impose development impact fees that would include a proportion for library services and facilities. However, the potential for this measure to be adopted by the City Council cannot be known, nor is it clear that such a measure would generate funding sufficient to fully fund library service improvements triggered by new development. No other mitigation is considered feasible, and impacts are significant and unavoidable (Final EIR, p. 5.13-24).

D. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - ROADWAY SYSTEM

Significant Project Impact (Roadway Traffic): Development consistent with Project implementation will facilitate new growth within the Planning Area that will generate additional roadway traffic. Analysis shows that several roadway linkages are projected to operate at LOS E or F at buildout. This analysis assumed a series of roadway widenings, intersection improvements, and other measures that are part of the Circulation and Community Mobility Element and are considered reasonably foreseeable. Even with all of these improvements, several roadway linkages will operate at unacceptable levels at buildout.

Roadways projected to be at LOS E upon full implementation of land use policy are:

- Portions of **Van Buren Boulevard** south of Cypress, south of Indiana, near Wood, and near the Trautwein intersection, as well as west of the I-215 interchange
- **Arlington Avenue** east of SR-91
- **Alessandro Boulevard** between Trautwein and I-215
- **Madison Street** north of SR-91

Roadways projected to be at LOS F upon full implementation of land use policy are:

- Portions of **Van Buren Boulevard** north of Cypress, between Lincoln and Mockingbird Canyon, locations between Wood and Sycamore Canyon
- Portions of **La Sierra Avenue** from near SR-91 to Dufferin
- **Trautwein Road** between Alessandro and Van Buren
- **Alessandro Boulevard** from Central to Trautwein
- Portions of **Arlington Avenue** and **Chicago Avenue** near Alessandro
- Portions of **Martin Luther King Boulevard** between SR-91 and SR-60

The Circulation and Community Mobility Element makes the following statement regarding LOS:

The City will strive to maintain LOS D or better on arterial streets wherever possible. At some key locations, such as City arterial roadways which are used as a freeway bypass by regional through traffic and at heavily traveled freeway interchanges, LOS E may be acceptable as determined on a case-by-case basis. Locations that may warrant the LOS E

standard include portions of Arlington Avenue/Alessandro Boulevard, Van Buren Boulevard throughout the City, portions of La Sierra Avenue and selected freeway interchanges (Circulation and Mobility Element, p. CCM-13).

Taking the noted policy statement into account, the portions of Van Buren Boulevard, Arlington Avenue, and Alessandro Boulevard projected to operate at LOS E are considered acceptable. Therefore, at these locations impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

However, the portion of Madison Street projected to operate at LOS E and all of the segments operating at LOS F are considered unacceptable. Along these segments, impacts are considered significant, and mitigation is required.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which lessen the significant environmental effect identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not entirely reduce impacts to the local roadway network to a level below significance and intersections will still operate with unacceptable LOS. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no additional feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. Also, the City has included focused intersection improvement projects in the Circulation and Community Mobility Element that will improve intersection operations and levels of service (see discussion above) and thereby enhance the overall function of the circulation system in the long term. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation Measure T-1 will help the City identify potential roadway linkage impacts over the course of Project implementation. Due to the uncertain nature of which roadways will actually need improvements and what if any improvements can feasibly mitigate unacceptable conditions, Mitigation Measure T-1 will not reduce potential impacts below a level of significance. To address impacts to these roadway linkages, the following mitigation measure is required:

T-1 The City will monitor traffic levels along roadway linkages projected to operate at unacceptable levels at Project buildout. As level of service measurements appear poised to be worse than LOS D, the City will identify any potential additional intersection and roadway improvements that would improve localized LOS, implementing all such improvement deemed feasible.

Identified roadway segment impacts are thus considered significant and unavoidable. Additionally, as no mitigation is available for the Magnolia/Central/Brockton intersection nor for the freeway segment impacts, impacts are also significant and unavoidable.

X. CUMULATIVE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15355) define a cumulative impact as “an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.” The Guidelines further state that “an EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the evaluated project.”

Section 15130(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of cumulative impacts of a project “when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.” Cumulatively considerable, as defined by Section 15065(c), “means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.”

The project is the adoption and long-term implementation of the City of Riverside General Plan, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines. The General Plan will guide the overall physical development and circulation of the entire City through 2025. Thus, cumulative citywide impacts have been addressed in the preceding discussion in this Findings of Fact. A broader discussion of cumulative impacts involves considering development beyond 2025 pursuant to the General Plan, together with ambient growth in neighboring jurisdictions. The Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will guide development within the Magnolia Avenue area of the plan.

A. AIR QUALITY

Significant Cumulative Impacts (PM₁₀): For all pollutant categories except PM₁₀, long-term pollutant emissions in 2025 are projected to decrease relative to existing year 2004 conditions. This can be explained by several factors and specifically, anticipated effective efforts of the SCAQMD to improve the Basin’s air quality. PM₁₀ typically originates from the stationary combustion of solid fuels, construction activities, industrial processes and atmospheric chemical reactions. Under 2004 existing land use conditions, the Planning Area generates approximately 16,000 pounds per day of PM₁₀ emissions; daily emissions are expected to increase by 50% at Project buildout, even with proposed Project mitigation measures. A possible explanation for PM₁₀ increasing through 2025 is a lack of specific legal control measures for this pollutant. PM₁₀ will continue to be emitted from diesel exhaust and tire wear, which are difficult to regulate. Levels of PM₁₀ have exceeded State standards regularly in the past and are expected to continue exceeding these standards in the future.

Therefore, long-term PM₁₀ air quality impacts resulting from implementation of the Project will be significant, and mitigation is required. Air pollutants levels of PM₁₀ are expected to continue to exceed the SCAQMD threshold criteria for significance. Impact associated with PM₁₀ emissions and cumulative construction activity is significant and unavoidable. Although individual projects will be reviewed pursuant to CEQA, because Riverside is located within a nonattainment air basin, the potential impact will remain significant and unavoidable at the cumulative level.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes,

however, will not reduce cumulative PM₁₀ air quality impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential short- and long-term cumulative air quality impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of all mitigation measures described below. These mitigation measures are feasible, will be required as a condition of approval on development projects, and will be made binding upon development entitlements through these Findings.

Policies within the General Plan Air Quality Element will facilitate continued City cooperation with SCAQMD and SCAG to achieve regional air quality improvement goals, encourage alternative transportation modes and implement transportation demand management strategies. In addition to the policies found in Section 5.3 Air Quality in the Final EIR, the following mitigation measures will further reduce PM₁₀ impacts:

- AQ-1 In accordance with AQMD Rule 403, the City will require the following measures to be taken during the construction of all projects to reduce the amount of dust and other sources of PM₁₀:
- Dust suppression at construction site using surfactants and other chemical stabilizers
 - Wheel washers for construction equipment
 - The watering down of all construction areas (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25)
- AQ-2 The City will continue to implement effective citywide street sweeping (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25).
- AQ-3 The City will use Best Available Control Technology in the City's practices, including but not limited to advanced diesel particulate traps on all City vehicles and purchase and use of aqueous diesel fuel vehicles (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).
- AQ-4 The City will adopt and implement a dust control ordinance for the purpose of establishing minimum requirements for construction and demolition activities and other specified sources in order to reduce man-made fugitive dust and the corresponding PM₁₀ emissions (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).
- AQ-5 The City will work to divert commercial truck traffic to off-peak periods to alleviate non-recurrent congestion as a means to improve roadway efficiency and reduce diesel emissions (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).
- AQ-6 The City will adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to manage paved and unpaved roads and parking lots so they produce the minimum practicable level of particulates (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).
- AQ-7 The City will collaborate with the EPA, SCAQMD and/or warehouse owners and operators to create regulations and programs to reduce the amount of diesel fumes released due to warehousing operation (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

Potential cumulative short- and long-term air quality impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of the mitigation measures. Nevertheless, these impacts will remain significant and are unavoidable (Final EIR, p. 5.3-25).

Significant Cumulative Impacts: The City of Riverside is located within the South Coast Air Basin, where pollutant levels regularly exceed State and federal air quality standards. The basin is identified as a nonattainment area with regard to meeting federal standards for ozone (O₃) and respirable particulate (PM₁₀). Future development in Riverside and adjacent communities will continue to add pollutants to the atmosphere from both transportation and stationary sources. Potential cumulative air quality impacts will be partially reduced through implementation of SCAQMD's *Air Quality Management Plan* and policies and programs contained in local General Plans, including the Air Quality Element of the Riverside General Plan. In particular, land use and transportation policies that encourage more compact development near transit centers will reduce mobile source emissions relative to conditions absent such policies. However, since the combined emissions from development in Riverside and surrounding communities will continue to exceed State and federal standards, cumulative air quality impact will be significant and unavoidable.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not reduce cumulative air quality impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential short- and long-term cumulative air quality impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of all mitigation measures described above in these Findings and policies found in Section 5.3, Air Quality, of the Final EIR. Because the Planning Area lies within a non-attainment air basin for criteria pollutants, potential air quality impacts related to emission of criteria pollutants will also remain significant and unavoidable. The significance of impacts to air quality resulting from specific future development projects will be determined on a project-by-project basis. If project-level impacts are identified, specific mitigation will be required per CEQA (Final EIR, p. 5.3-26).

B. NOISE

Significant Cumulative Impacts: Anticipated development within the Planning Area will generate short-term noise during the construction of individual developments. Additional development in the Planning Area (and, significantly, in the greater region) will increase traffic volumes and associated long-term noise levels. Implementing local noise codes, constructing buildings according to state acoustical standards, and proper land use planning will reduce cumulative impacts on residences, schools, hospitals, and other noise-sensitive uses.

However, as described in Section 5.11 of the Final EIR, development pursuant to land use policies could result in an increase in traffic noise along freeways, major arterials and railways. The analysis in Section 5.11 also accounts for ambient regional traffic growth as a significant factor in raising local noise levels. Noise associated with planned operations for Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport, and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Cargo Port are also projected to increase. Cumulative noise levels along roadway corridors will result in the continued exposure of some

residential areas to noise levels inconsistent with the City's noise/land use compatibility criteria set forth in Figure 5-23 in Section 5.11 of the Final EIR. Land use policies work to reduce airport noise/land use conflicts to a less than significant level (Final EIR, p. 5.11-32).

As for new development, interior noise levels of future residential development projects in these areas will be required to be reduced to at least 45 d(B)A, consistent with State Title 24 Noise Insulation requirements. However, the extent to which exterior sound levels can be brought within acceptable levels is unclear.

The Project could facilitate development along regional freeways and major arterials where regionally generated traffic is a substantial source of future noise. The Final EIR has determined that land use compatibility impacts associated with these increased noise levels cannot be mitigated. The Project would be contributing to this significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impact.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR. These changes, however, will not reduce exterior sounds impacts to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential cumulative noise impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of policies in the General Plan and summarized in Section 5.11, Noise, of the Final EIR. The Final EIR analysis has determined that land use compatibility impacts associated with these increased noise levels cannot be mitigated. The Project would be contributing to this significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impact (Final EIR, p. 5.11-37).

C. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Significant Cumulative Impact: Development consistent with Project implementation will facilitate new growth throughout the Planning Area that will generate additional roadway traffic within the Planning Area and the region. The Final EIR shows that several roadway segments, including roadways in the downtown area, are projected to operate at LOS E or F at full implementation of the land use policy, as shown in Figure 5-40 (2025 Volume to Capacity Ratio) on page 5.15-35. Roadways projected to be at LOS E upon buildout are:

- Portions of **Van Buren Boulevard** south of Cypress, south of Indiana, near Wood, and near the Trautwein intersection, as well as west of the I-215 interchange
- **Arlington Avenue** east of SR-91
- **Alessandro Boulevard** between Trautwein and I-215
- **Madison Street** north of SR-91

Roadways projected to be at LOS F upon buildout are:

- Portions of **Van Buren Boulevard** north of Cypress, between Lincoln and Mockingbird Canyon, locations between Wood and Sycamore Canyon
- Portions of **La Sierra Avenue** from near SR-91 to Dufferin
- **Trautwein Road** between Alessandro and Van Buren

- **Alessandro Boulevard** from Central to Trautwein
- Portions of **Arlington Avenue** and **Chicago Avenue** near Alessandro
- Portions of **Martin Luther King Boulevard** between SR-91 and SR-60

As stated above in these Findings, analysis has shown that several roadway segments and intersections within the Planning Area will operate at an unacceptable LOS with Project implementation. In addition, Project implementation will contribute to additional traffic on the regional freeways that traverse the Planning Area. Adherence to and implementation of Project objectives and policies will help ameliorate potential traffic impacts citywide at a programmatic level.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required of or incorporated into the Project which substantially lessen the project's contribution to cumulatively significant environmental effects identified in the Final Program EIR. These changes, however, will not completely reduce impacts on the local roadway system to a level below significance. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), there are no additional feasible measures that would mitigate these impacts below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council has determined that these impacts are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential cumulative transportation/traffic impacts would be substantially lessened by implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 and City strategies. Mitigation Measure T-1 will help the City identify potential roadway linkage impacts over the course of Project implementation. Due to the uncertain nature of which roadways will actually need improvements and what if any improvements can feasibly mitigate unacceptable conditions, the Mitigation Measure will not reduce potential impacts below a level of significance. However, the measure is feasible, will be required as condition of approval on development applications, and will be made binding upon development entitlements as applicable through these Findings.

T-1 The City will monitor traffic levels along roadway linkages projected to operate at unacceptable levels at Project buildout. As level of service measurements appear poised to be worse than LOS D, the City will identify any potential additional intersection and roadway improvements that would improve localized LOS, implementing all such improvement deemed feasible.

Despite the Mitigation Measure and other Project features designed to reduce traffic impacts, the Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts will remain significant and unavoidable (Final EIR, p. 5.15-63).

XI. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR discuss the growth-inducing impact of the proposed project. Growth-inducement includes, "...ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which will remove

obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas)."

The Project is specifically intended to provide for the orderly development and redevelopment of Riverside, define the limits of such development, and act as a mechanism to accommodate and control future development. Projects permitted pursuant to the Land Use Policy Map in **Figure 3-3** of the General Plan will accommodate additional housing for all income levels, create a better balance of residential and non-residential uses in the community, promote a more pedestrian-friendly environment, and protect natural resources. A major feature of the Project is the introduction of higher-density residential and mixed use designations along major transportation corridors, which will be implemented through three new mixed-use zones and a new "R-4" zone. These areas are intended to focus population growth in already urbanized areas, reducing development pressure of the urban edge. Implementation of the Project will result in a more inclusive community, bring new employment opportunities to Riverside, and foster a stable economic base.

Development pursuant to Project policies and regulatory standards will result in the addition of up to 38,100 new dwelling units (increase of 42 percent) and 39,600,000 square feet (increase of 31 percent) of new non-residential construction over the 20-year horizon of the General Plan. The increased population and employment associated with proposed General Plan land use policy has the potential to induce growth in areas outside of Riverside. However, this potential growth inducement is not significant because: 1) the Project is generally consistent with SCAG population and housing forecasts (Section 5.12 - Population and Housing); 2) within the last 20 years, Riverside has been, in many respects, a bedroom community of Los Angeles and Orange counties, and the Project aims to better balance jobs and housing by bringing additional employment opportunities to the Planning Area; 3) the Project emphasizes smart-growth, infill, and revitalization of vacant and under-utilized parcels served by existing infrastructure; and 4) the Land Use and Urban Design Element is required to designate adequate sites to accommodate any future "fair share" of regional housing needs (RHNA).

Given that a project's level of impact in such areas as traffic, air quality, and community services is related to the density of development permitted, the goal of a balanced General Plan should be to facilitate the amount and kind of growth necessary to achieve a city's social and fiscal goals without promoting excessive growth which will be costly to the city in terms of environmental impacts and service providers (Final EIR, p. 6-9 and 6-10).

XII. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Development consistent with the Project will result in the consumption of non-renewable energy resources which will have an irreversible effect on such resources. In addition, the development consistent with the Project will result in development of urban uses in areas that are currently vacant, although a key focus of the Project is to direct most development to already urbanized areas. Once developed, reverting to a less urban use or open space is highly unlikely. Development in Riverside according to the Project will also constrain future land use options.

Several irreversible commitments of limited resources will result from implementation of the proposed Project. The resources include, lumber and other related forest products, sand, gravel, concrete, asphalt, petrochemical construction materials, steel, copper, lead and other metals, and water consumption. Buildout of the General Plan represents a long-term commitment to the consumption of fossil fuel oil, natural gas and gasoline. These increased energy demands relate to construction, lighting, heating and cooling of residences, and transportation of people within, to and from the City (Final EIR, p. 6-10).

XIII. FEASIBILITY OF POTENTIAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Because the Project will result in unavoidable significant environmental effects, as outlined in Section VIII and Section IX of these Findings, the City must consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternative to the Project, as finally approved. The City must evaluate whether one or more of these alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen the unavoidable significant environmental effect(s). (Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta, 198 Cal. App. 3d 433, 243 Cal. Rptr. 727 (1988); see also Pub. Res. Code Section 21002.)

Because an alternative or alternatives may result in reduced impacts in some areas but not others, resulting in a need to balance impacts against City policies and objectives, these Findings contrast and compare the alternatives analyzed in the Final Program EIR with the Project.

In general, in preparing and adopting findings, a lead agency need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating the approval of a project with significant impacts. Where the significant impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable (less than significant) level solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of environmentally superior alternatives, even if their impacts would be less severe than those of the Project as mitigated. (Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California, 47 Cal. 3d 376, 253 Cal. Rptr. 426 [1988]; Laurel Hills Homeowners Ass'n v. City Council, 83 Cal. App. 3d 515, 147 Cal. Rptr. 842 [1978]; see also Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford, 221 Cal. App. 3d 692, 270 Cal. Rptr. 650 [1990]). Accordingly, for this Project, in adopting the findings concerning Project alternatives, the City Council considers only those environmental impacts that for the finally Approved Project are significant and cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through mitigation.

The Project is the adoption and implementation of the following programmatic documents. Each is discussed below in greater detail within Section 3.0, Project Description of the Final EIR.

1. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside General Plan
2. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code of the City of Riverside) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names
3. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code of the City of Riverside)
4. Adoption of Citywide Design Guidelines
5. The Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan

According to the analysis presented in the prior sections, adoption of the Project will result in unavoidable significant impacts with regard to the following issue areas:

Air Quality: Long-term PM₁₀ emissions

Noise: Long-term roadway and freeway noise

Public Services – Libraries: Inadequate facilities and volumes

Transportation/Traffic: Intersection, roadway linkage, and freeway impacts

In addition to these significant unavoidable impacts, the analysis presented in the prior sections identified significant impacts related to the following issue areas, all of which can be mitigated below a level of significance:

Aesthetics: Visual character and scenic resources

Geology/Soils: Erosion impacts

Hydrology/Water Quality: Compliance with NPDES requirements

Land Use and Planning: Conflicts with redevelopment plans

Public Services: Police and fire/emergency services

Where significant environmental effects remain even after application of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final Program EIR, decision makers must evaluate the Project alternatives identified in the Final Program EIR. Under these circumstances, CEQA requires findings on the feasibility of Project alternatives. If no Project alternatives are feasible, decision makers must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the Project. If there is a feasible alternative to the Project, decision makers must decide whether it is environmentally superior to the Project. Proposed Project alternatives considered must be ones which “could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project.” However, the Guidelines also require an EIR to examine alternatives “capable of eliminating” environmental effects even if these alternatives “would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[d]).

CEQA provides the following definition of the term “feasible,” as it applies to the findings requirement: “‘Feasible’ means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors” (Public Resources Code Section 21061.1). The CEQA Guidelines provide a broader definition of “feasibility” that also encompasses “legal” factors. CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 states, “The lack of legal powers of an agency to use in imposing an alternative or mitigation measure may be as great a limitation as any economic, environmental, social or technological factor.”

Accordingly, “feasibility” is a term of art under CEQA and thus is afforded a different meaning as may be provided by a dictionary or other source. Moreover, CEQA Section 21081 governs the “findings” requirement under CEQA with regard to the feasibility of alternatives and states, in pertinent part, that:

... no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings: (a)(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

The concept of “feasibility,” therefore, as it applies to findings, involves a balancing of various economic, environmental, social, legal and technological factors. (See Pub. Res. Code § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15364; Public Resources Code Section 21081; see also City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego, 133 Cal. App. 3d 401, 414-417 [1992].)

In City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego, 133 Cal. App. 3d 401, 415-417 (1992), the Court found that the City of San Diego had “. . . considered and reasonably rejected ... [certain] project alternatives ... as infeasible in view of the social and economic realities in the region.” (Id at 417.) The Court determined that the City of San Diego had attempted to accommodate the feasibility factors based on its growth management plan, which included the proposed development project. Accordingly, the Court concluded:

Assuming this accommodation is a reasonable one (citation omitted), San Diego is entitled to rely on it in evaluating various project alternatives. The cost-benefit analysis which led to the accommodation is of course subject to review, but it need not be mechanically stated at each stage of the approval process. In this sense, “feasibility” under CEQA encompasses “desirability” to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. We accordingly conclude that San Diego did not abuse its discretion under CEQA in rejecting the various project alternatives as infeasible. (Id.)

These Findings contrast and compare the alternatives where appropriate to demonstrate that the selection of the finally approved Project, while still resulting in significant environmental impacts, has substantial environmental, planning, fiscal, and other benefits. These benefits are discussed in detail in Section XIV. In rejecting all of the alternatives, the City Council has examined the approved Project objectives and weighed the ability of the various alternatives to meet the objectives. The decision makers believe that the Project best meets the approved Project objectives with the least environmental impact.

The Project objectives identified by the City in the Final Program EIR include:

General Plan Update

- Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through redesignation of lands for mixed use development.
- Enact “smart growth principles” to improve quality of life for City residents and reduce urban sprawl.
- Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.
- Establish neighborhoods as the fundamental planning units of the City.
- Preserve and enhance the City’s natural and cultural assets.
- Provide circulation facilities adequate to serve proposed land uses and meet community needs.
- Minimize the negative impacts of regional traffic upon the City’s local roadways.

- Establish policies to facilitate partnerships among Riverside's cultural and educational institutions to achieve community goals.
- Establish policies and programs to enhance the City's standing as the arts and culture center of the Inland Empire.
- Establish policies and programs that will contribute to the improvement of local and regional air quality.
- Establish policies to ensure that people are protected from health and safety hazards and unwanted noise intrusion.
- Ensure the provision of adequate public facilities and public services to existing and to-be-developed portions of the Planning Area.

Zoning Code Update

- Update Zoning Code text and map to reflect new land use policies contained in the updated General Plan.
- Reorganize to create a logical and intuitive format to facilitate use by citizens, interested parties and City staff responsible for zoning administration.
- Make consistent with the most recent changes in State and federal laws and regulations.
- Reduce and reorganize residential, commercial and industrial zoning districts to simplify the land use classification system.
- Simplify and streamline procedures and processes.

Subdivision Code Update

- Reorganize to create a logical and intuitive format to facilitate use by citizens, land developers and City staff responsible for subdivision administration.
- Make consistent with the most recent changes in state and federal laws and regulations.
- Update to reflect new land use and circulation policies contained in the updated General Plan.
- Simplify and streamline procedures and processes.

Citywide Design Guidelines

- Provide visual examples of desirable and allowable design features applicable to all new future development.
- Reduce uncertainty in the discretionary review of new developments.

- Provide for quality building design.
- Provide for signage that complements developments and achieves the City's overall design objectives.
- Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.
- Facilitate excellent design that can contribute to increased property values throughout the City.

Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan

- Provide a detailed framework of growth and change for the City's transportation backbone consistent with land use, urban design and circulation objectives and policies within the General Plan update.
- Develop an improvement plan for the "flytrap" intersection of Magnolia/Brockton/Central that improves traffic flow and increases driver and pedestrian safety.
- Enhance the public streetscape of Magnolia Avenue.
- Facilitate transit usage along Riverside's principal arterial roadway.
- Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Magnolia Avenue.

The Final Program EIR for the Project examined a broad range of reasonable alternatives to the Project to determine whether Project objectives could be met while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the Project's significant, unavoidable impacts. Adoption of the Project will result in unavoidable significant impacts with regard to transportation/traffic, air quality, noise, and public services-libraries. Impacts of the Project will result in significant soil erosion impacts (Geology/Soils), surface hydrology impacts—compliance with NPDES requirements (Hydrology/Water Quality), conflicts with redevelopment plans (Land Use and Planning) and police and fire emergency services (Public Services) impacts that will be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation. Because the Project has identified significant and unavoidable impacts and none of the examined alternatives would avoid these impacts, the City has properly considered and reasonably rejected Project alternatives as infeasible pursuant to CEQA.

A. NO PROJECT

The No Project Alternative assumes that all components of the Project – the updates to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Subdivision Code, and the new Design Guidelines and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan – would not be adopted. Instead, the No Project Alternative compares environmental impacts associated with development of the Planning Area per the existing General Plan and Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Further, neither the proposed Design Guidelines nor the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be adopted.

A key innovation of the proposed Project involves land use changes in about two dozen focus areas. Many of these focus areas are located along Magnolia and University Avenues and are planned for mixed-use development. Although the existing General Plan included mixed-use land

use designations, the application of these designations was quite limited. In addition, the existing Zoning Code does not include corresponding mixed-use zoning classifications. As such, the likelihood of new mixed-use development is much lower under the existing General Plan than under the proposed Project. As a result, new development pursuant to the existing General Plan would be somewhat more broadly diffused throughout the Planning Area, whereas the Project seeks some concentration of new development along already urbanized major travel corridors.

1. Significant and/or Unavoidable Impacts

Traffic: Continued implementation of the existing General Plan, Zoning Code, and Subdivision Code would result in a similar level of development and population growth as the proposed Project, although the proposed Project would concentrate this development along already urbanized major travel corridors. The No Project alternative would not yield such concentration.

Existing City policies do not facilitate mixed-use development as effectively as the proposed Project. For example, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed guidance development along this corridor, where a significant portion of new mixed-use development is proposed. Notably, mixed-use development will contribute fewer vehicle trips relative to developments along the urban periphery. Further, intersection and roadway improvements included in the proposed Project will lead to measurable improvements at key locations. Moreover, the No Project Alternative would not include policies designed to minimize cut-through traffic intrusion into residential neighborhoods. In all, the No Project alternative would be expected to have similar or greater traffic impacts relative to the proposed Project (Final EIR, p. 7-5).

With regard to long-term circulation improvements, both the existing General Plan and proposed update provide for focused roadway widenings (e.g. Alessandro to six lanes) and the extension of Overlook Parkway. The Project provides for a more careful extension of Overlook Parkway through a specific study, thus better balancing transportation needs and neighborhood preservation goals.

Air Quality: Air pollutant emissions are most closely tied to traffic volumes, but are also related to construction activity. Under the No Project alternative, development would continue in existing patterns, with higher-intensity urban development more broadly diffused throughout the Planning Area than with the Project, which calls for additional infill development on underutilized parcels along major travel corridors, thus reducing the number and length of vehicle trips. However, analysis indicates that anticipated improvements in vehicle emissions are likely over the long term that will provide dramatic reductions in daily emissions of criteria pollutants, with the notable exception of PM₁₀. The No Project Alternative would thus be expected to have similar or greater air quality impacts to the proposed Project (Final EIR, p. 7-5).

Noise: As with air quality, noise impacts are closely tied to surface traffic volumes, but are also dependent upon air traffic patterns and, significantly, proposed land uses. Noise forecasts for roadways, freeways, railways, and air traffic indicate that larger portions of the Planning Area will in the future be subject to noise levels that may not be acceptable for certain types of development. However, roughly the same increases in freeway, railway and air traffic – and associated noise – will occur without the proposed Project, as these are only tangentially connected to increases in Planning Area population growth. The No Project alternative does not take these noise increases into account and as such, could result in the development of land uses incompatible with localized ambient noise levels (Final EIR, p. 7-5).

Library Services: Section 5.13 of the EIR indicates that existing library facilities and services do not meet City standards and that the addition of planned library facilities will not achieve City-established library standards. As such, the No Project alternative would have similar library service impacts relative to the proposed Project (Final EIR, p. 7-6).

Other Public Services: Development consistent with the No Project alternative would lead to similar population increases and thus similar Public Service impacts relative to the proposed Project (Final EIR, p. 7-6).

Geology/Soils: The Project includes an updated citywide geotechnical study and identifies places within the Planning Area susceptible to seismic and geologic hazards. The No Project Alternative would continue to utilize information from previous geotechnical studies. The Project thus provides a somewhat greater level of protection from potential geologic and seismic impacts (Final EIR, p. 7-6).

Hydrology/Water Quality: The No Project Alternative would not institute a number of Project policies related to the elimination and reduction of storm water runoff, improvements to the Santa Ana River watershed, and protection of groundwater supplies (Final EIR, p. 7-6). In this regard, the No Project alternative is inferior to the Project.

Land Use and Planning: The No Project Alternative would not implement the proposed General Plan nor the updated Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Notably, the No Project Alternative would not result in any conflicts with redevelopment plans, whereas under the proposed General Plan, several redevelopment plans will need to be amended for consistency purposes. However, this is considered a relatively minor advantage, in that State law (Health and Safety Code Section 33331) requires that redevelopment plans be consistent with a community's adopted General Plan.

The existing General Plan includes two mixed-use designations (residential and office), but the Zoning Code does not have corresponding zoning districts. The proposed Project provides a higher degree of coordination between the General Plan and the Zoning Code.

Notably, the No Project Alternative would lead to greater conflicts with such regional plans as the Riverside County General Plan (RCIP) and the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The proposed Project includes measures to ensure greater consistency with these plans; the No Project alternative would result in land use planning conflicts (Final EIR, p. 7-6).

2. Other Environmental Effects

Aesthetics: The proposed Project includes Citywide Design Guidelines that are intended to improve the visual quality of all new development. Further, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed site planning guidance for development along the Magnolia Avenue corridor; such guidance is intended in part to improve the visual quality of the corridor. Under the No Project Alternative, neither the Design Guidelines nor the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be in effect. As such, the No Project alternative would not achieve the aesthetic improvements to the degree associated with the proposed Project (Final EIR, p. 7-7).

Biological Resources: With the No Project Alternative, habitat-protective General Plan designations would not be implemented, potentially causing conflict with the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) and limiting the ability of the City to work with the County to ensure protection of dedicated wildlife corridors. The proposed Project, however, has

been designed to complement and implement the MSHCP. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would potentially introduce new impacts on biological resources (Final EIR, p. 7-7).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The No Project Alternative results in the same careful land use planning within the impact zones of Riverside Municipal Airport and March Air Reserve Base/Inland Cargo Port. As such, the No Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts relative to hazards (Final EIR, p. 7-7).

Population and Housing: With the No Project alternative, development pursuant to the existing General Plan would continue. The existing General Plan anticipated a population of 285,000 people within the City's then-limits by 2010. In 2004, SCAG projected that the City's population (excluding any sphere areas) would be 286,935 and would rise to 307,847 by 2010. However, maximum buildout capacity of the existing General Plan (with no specific associated date) was estimated at over 488,000 people over that plan's planning area. Both the proposed Project and the No Project alternative would enable development consistent with regional growth forecasts (Final EIR, p. 7-7).

Recreation: In 2003, the City adopted a Park and Recreation Master Plan, which is incorporated by summary and reference into the proposed General Plan. It is assumed that the goals and policies of the Master Plan would be implemented with or without adoption of the proposed Project. As such, impacts to recreational resources will be generally the same as those under the proposed Project. (Final EIR, p. 7-7)

Other Issue Areas

The No Project Alternative would have similar impacts to the proposed Project in the areas of Agricultural Resources, Cultural Resources, Mineral Resources, or Utilities.

In 2002, the City adopted a Historic Preservation Element separate from the Project. The Project incorporates but does not change the Historic Preservation Element. Therefore, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those of the Project.

The No Project Alternative would have a similar impact upon agricultural resources as would the Project, as both the existing General Plan and Zoning Code provide for appropriate designations and protections for agricultural areas in the City (Final EIR, p. 7-8).

3. Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would fail to meet most of the most critical Project Objectives, including implementation of smart growth principles, increased infill and mixed-use development, and reduced cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. The No Project Alternative would not achieve the goal of greater development on underutilized parcels along travel corridors but would instead foster perpetuation of existing growth patterns, including increased growth along the urban periphery (Final EIR, p. 7-8).

4. Conclusion

Development pursuant to the No Project Alternative would not avoid the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project and would not achieve most of the Project Objectives. Moreover, the No Project Alternative would have additional potentially significant impacts in the areas of

noise, aesthetics, biological resources, geology/soils and land use planning. The City rejects the No Project Alternative because it does not meet most of the basic project objectives as effectively as the Project (see City of Del Mar, *supra*, 133 Cal. App. 3d at 417; Sequoiah Hills, *supra*, 23 Cal. App. 4th at 715.).

B. 25 PERCENT REDUCTION ALTERNATIVE

Relative to the Project, this alternative would apply a 25 percent reduction citywide in the maximum allowable densities of all residential land uses and the maximum intensities of all commercial, industrial, office and public facilities land uses. The development yield for all new uses within the Downtown Specific Plan area would also be reduced by 25 percent. The Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be consistent with the proposed reductions. Zoning designations in the updated Zoning Code would be altered so that the maximum intensities/densities of the zoning districts would correspond to the General Plan land use designations. The Subdivision Code and Design Guidelines would be updated as currently proposed.

1. Significant and/or Unavoidable Impacts

This alternative is analyzed in the Final EIR as a means of reducing environmental impacts of the proposed Project by reducing development capacity within the Planning Area.

Environmental Effects

Reduced allowable densities and intensities would generate slightly lower vehicle trips compared to the proposed Project. This reduction could reduce identified traffic impacts on roadways, freeways and at one intersection, and lead to somewhat lower air quality and noise impacts. However, given strong regional growth forecasts for Western Riverside County, the imposition by the City of Riverside of such a strict growth limitation would most likely lead to increased development pressure in surrounding and nearby communities, including within sphere areas currently controlled by Riverside County, and possibly as far east as the cities of Beaumont and Banning and south to the cities of Perris and Hemet. With most regional freeways in Riverside County passing through or near Riverside, increased growth east and south of the City would still yield significant and adverse traffic, air quality, and noise impacts within the Planning Area.

Indeed, a major tenet of the proposed Project is to institute smart growth principles in which increased in-town densities and intensities will decrease demand for growth on the urban periphery. The proposed Project seeks to aggressively improve the City's jobs-housing balance so that residents will have greater options to work within Riverside rather than endure long commutes west to Los Angeles and Orange counties. Proposed infill development will make more efficient use of land and infrastructure, and will require comparatively fewer vehicle trips and vehicle miles than comparably sized development located on "greenfields" on the urban edge.

The 25 Percent Reduction Alternative would, however, reduce impacts on all public services, recreation facilities, and public utilities. Allowing a reduced level of residential and non-residential development would lead to decreased demand for these services, facilities, and utilities both relative to the Project and No Project Alternative. This alternative could also reduce hydrological impacts, in that a reduction in maximum allowable density/intensity could lead to reductions in impervious coverage and increased area available for groundwater recharge.

However, this alternative would lead to potentially complex land use and planning conflicts. Many parcels in the City are currently developed at the maximum allowable density/intensity. An across-the-board reduction in maximum allowable density would create nonconformities on any lot developed at or within 25 percent of the maximum allowable level.

This alternative would have comparable impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture, cultural resources, geology, hazards, and mineral resources (Final EIR, p. 7-9).

2. Project Objectives

The 25 Percent Reduction alternative would achieve several of the Project Objectives, including all of those associated with the Subdivision Code update and the Citywide Design Guidelines. However, this alternative would be unlikely to achieve some of the most critical objectives of the entire Project. Specifically, this alternative would make it more difficult to achieve the infill/smart growth objectives of the Project. The lowering of allowable intensities could slacken development interest in the community. Allowing for higher-density development is understood to be a key factor associated with successfully achieving infill development. If allowable development capacity is reduced to a point where it is comparable with levels allowable on the urban fringe, development is more likely to occur on the urban fringe. As such, the alternative would likely lead to greater urban sprawl in western Riverside County (Final EIR, p. 7-9 and 7-10).

3. Conclusion

Development consistent with the 25 Percent Reduction Alternative would be unlikely to lessen the significant unavoidable impacts relative to traffic, air quality, and noise that are associated with the proposed Project. This alternative would reduce identified significant impacts on library services and would lead to reduced demands for public utilities, other public services, and recreational facilities. However, this alternative would fail to meet the most critical Project Objectives related to infill development, reduction of urban sprawl, and other related smart growth principles. The City rejects the Alternative because it does not meet most of the basic project objectives as effectively as the Project (see City of Del Mar, *supra*, 133 Cal. App. 3d at 417; Sequoiah Hills, *supra*, 23 Cal. App. 4th at 715).

C. INCREASED MIXED USE ALONG “L” CORRIDOR

This alternative is analyzed within the Draft EIR as a means of reducing environmental impacts of the proposed Project by seeking to increase allowable levels of mixed-use development along the so-called “L” corridor of Magnolia Avenue and University Avenue. While the proposed Project itself seeks to place a significant amount of new development along this corridor by introducing enabling land use and zoning tools to do so, this Alternative would increase the allowable density/intensity of mixed-use development along the corridor by a factor of 25 percent over the levels permitted by the proposed Project. The alternative would permit comparable proportions of non-residential and residential development relative to the proposed Project. This alternative involves changes primarily to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan; the Subdivision Code and Citywide Design Guidelines be revised as currently proposed.

1. Significant and/or Unavoidable Impacts

Development consistent with the alternative would, at buildout, result in increased development along the “L” corridor relative to the proposed Project. In the short term, the significant environmental impacts of this alternative could be equal to or greater than those of the proposed Project. The alternative could result in greater residential and commercial development of the corridor, which could modestly increase traffic levels relative to the proposed Project, as well as create additional air quality impacts and generate noise levels comparable to or greater than the proposed Project. The increased population would also contribute to additional impacts on library services.

In the longer term, however, the higher levels of allowable development could have the seemingly counterintuitive result of decreased levels in several of these impact categories. More dense/intense mixed-use developments would put more people closer to opportunities to shop and work, potentially decreasing traffic volumes as more people walk or use readily available transit service. More intensive development of the corridor would also strengthen the viability of transit along the corridor, as more users would live or work in close proximity to a bus line. Over time, increased demand and use of transit would lead to additional transit service, which could draw new users. Further, more intense mixed-use development would have a stronger potential to increase bicycle usage and walking as an alternative to vehicular trips.

These potentialities of higher intensity/density mixed-use development cannot be modeled or predicted precisely. Traffic modeling techniques tend to assume traffic projections based on land use without great sensitivity to surrounding areas. Most modeling techniques assume that a project will consist of auto-oriented development, basing trip generation rates on averages of rates observed elsewhere. Adjustments can be made to a model to factor in greater usage of transit, walking, biking, and other alternative transportation; such adjustments cannot be realistically effectuated, however, until development reaches a critical mass. For these reasons, the analysis in the Final EIR assumes that increased levels of mixed-use development along the “L” corridor could lead to increased population, traffic, air quality, and noise impacts relative to the proposed Project.

The alternative would have comparable impacts with respect to aesthetics, agricultural, biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology, and mineral resources. Increased development within the mixed-use areas would increase impacts relative to public services, utilities, and recreational resources (Final EIR, p. 7-10 and 7-11).

2. Project Objectives

This alternative would achieve all of the Project Objectives as well as if not more effectively than the proposed Project. The alternative is consistent with smart growth principles; increasing allowable development levels in the “L” corridor could be a strong incentive to the development community to undertake infill and mixed-use developments. The risks of such development compared to single-use, greenfield development are perceived to be high; many in the development community posit that higher allowable intensities/densities are necessary to offset potential risk (Final EIR, p. 7-11).

3. Conclusion

The alternative could result in traffic, air quality, and noise impacts similar to or greater than those of the proposed Project. Impacts on public services and recreational resources would be equal to or greater than those related to the proposed Project. The City rejects the Alternative because it does

not meet most of the basic project objectives as effectively as the Project (see City of Del Mar, *supra*, 133 Cal. App. 3d at 417; Sequoiah Hills, *supra*, 23 Cal. App. 4th at 715).

XIV. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA allows a public agency to approve a project with significant, unavoidable impacts if the agency finds that the project will provide overriding economic, social, or other benefits.

A. SIGNIFICANT, UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed Project will result in significant, unavoidable direct and cumulative air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic impacts, and direct impact on library facilities. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and other Project features and implementation of mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.3 - Air Quality**, **Section 5.11 - Noise**, **Section 5.13 - Public Services**, and **Section 5.15 - Transportation and Traffic** will reduce the air quality, noise, public services, and transportation and traffic impacts to an extent; however, these impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

The City Council hereby finds that the Project would or could have significant, unavoidable impacts on the following areas, as described in Sections VIII and IX of these Findings:

- Air Quality - Short-term and long-term PM₁₀ (Direct and Cumulative)
- Noise - Long-term roadway and freeway noise (Direct and Cumulative)
- Transportation/Traffic (Direct and Cumulative)
- Public Services - Libraries (Direct)

The City has adopted all feasible measures with respect to these impacts. Although in some instances mitigation measures may substantially lessen these significant impacts, adoption of such measures will not fully avoid the impacts or mitigate them to below a level of significance.

The City has examined a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project, including the No Project Alternative described in the Final Program EIR. Based on this examination, the City has determined that Alternative 3: Concentration of New Growth along “L” Corridor would also meet the Project objectives as effectively as the Project. The No Project Alternative would have greater impacts with respect to noise, aesthetics, biological resources, geology/soils, and land use and planning than the Project. In addition, all of the alternatives examined would have significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

As a result, to approve the Project, the City must adopt a “statement of overriding considerations” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043 and 15093. This statement allows the lead agency to cite a project’s general economic, social, or other benefits as a justification for choosing to allow the occurrence of specified significant environmental effects that have not been avoided. The statement explains why, in the agency’s judgment, the project’s benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant effects.

CEQA does not require lead agencies to analyze beneficial effects in an EIR. Rather, EIRs are to focus on potential “significant effects on the environment,” which are defined to be adverse impacts

(Public Resources Code Section 21068). The Legislature amended the definition to focus on adverse impacts after the California Supreme Court had held that beneficial impacts must also be addressed (see Wildlife Alive v. Chickering, 18 Cal.3d 190, 206, 132 Cal.Rptr. 377 [1976]). Nevertheless, decision makers benefit from information about Project benefits. These benefits can be cited in a statement of overriding considerations (see CEQA Guidance).

B. PROJECT BENEFITS

The City finds that the Project would have the following substantial economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the Project, and the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable when any one of the following project benefits are considered.

1. **Growth will be targeted to serve community need and enhance the quality of life.** The pattern of development established by the Land Use and Urban Design Element - and implemented largely through Zoning Code regulations - focuses on “smart growth principles” to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl by providing well-planned infill development Citywide, allowing for increased density in selected areas along established transportation corridors. Growth will be targeted to areas of Riverside that are well served by public transit and that provide opportunities for residences, retail businesses, and employment centers to be located close to one another. This approach to development encourages street-level economic development by putting pedestrians in close proximity to retail, restaurant, and commercial/office uses. Residents could work, live, shop, and play in transit-oriented areas, thereby encouraging economic growth and reducing automobile dependence. In this way, the Project promotes smart growth principles that call for compact, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods that minimize the amount of open space lands that would be converted to urban uses. This approach to development reduces new vehicle trips resulting from new development and correspondingly, reduces traffic and associated air pollutant emissions. In this respect, this pattern of development benefits Riverside and the region.
2. **Land use and transportation policy will help grow the local economy and create opportunities for new businesses.** The Project allows for up to 39.6 million square feet of net new nonresidential development in the form of commercial, office, and industrial space. This additional space will add opportunities to create new jobs, building improvements, retention of the existing companies, a diverse economy, and infrastructure. Riverside's growth has resulted in many beneficial effects, principally the development of industries and businesses that provide jobs and economic stability, creation of housing units affordable to a broad range of household incomes, the growth of educational institutions, and the vibrancy that results from a diverse, multi-ethnic and cultural community.

Diverse Economy: Riverside has been fortunate to maintain a diverse set of business sectors. Finance, engineering, retail, education, research, and healthcare contribute significantly to the collective community income. This diverse economy helps with a wide variety issues such as preventing severe fluctuations in the local job market, helps stabilize revenues for municipal services, and strengthens the City's bond rating.

Infrastructure: A common generalization directed to new construction projects is that they put added strain of services and infrastructure. Although there are specific areas in the city that require street, sewer, or some other upgrades, it is often the case that new construction supports (through fees and off site requirements) infrastructure upgrades to nearby streets,

storm drains, street lights, sidewalks, street trees, and street signals. The General Plan update specifically directs growth to areas where it is best supported by existing infrastructure and services.

3. **Land use and transportation policies and programs will help reduce long commutes outside Riverside and reduce local trips, thereby reducing attendant local and regional traffic and air quality impacts.** The Project seeks to create opportunities for more Riversiders to work in Riverside and avoid long commutes to employment in Los Angeles and Orange counties. Also, through implementation of the Riverside Park trails concept, Bus Rapid Transit, and mixed-use development approach, residents will have increased ability to walk, bike, and use transit for local trips. With the increased ability of the City to focus new development at locations served by transit, the City can better manage its own bus system and encourage use of buses and the Metrolink light rail. The major principles underlying the Project are focusing future development near existing transportation corridors, ensuring land uses are supported by an efficient local roadway network, embracing innovative solutions to congestion on freeways and regional arterials, supporting alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking and transit, and ensuring that transportation options are maximized for all community members as necessary components of an effective and safe circulation system for Riverside. Land use policy will facilitate managed growth that can create the critical user mass needed to support expanded alternative transportation systems.
4. **Riverside will be promoted as a healthy family community.** Opportunities for the provision of affordable housing will be expanded. The updated Housing Element establishes varied housing opportunities while preserving and enhancing established neighborhoods. New houses, well-designed apartments, mixed use in Downtown areas, and landscape amenities will complement established neighborhoods. City programs and policies will enhance housing opportunities, protect the character of single-family neighborhoods, and improve the quality of life.

Residential neighborhoods will be protected from adverse traffic conditions. Circulation and Community Mobility Element policies call for through traffic to be directed to travel corridors that avoid residential neighborhoods and specifically along Van Buren Boulevard and Alessandro Boulevard. This approach to traffic management will result in higher traffic volumes along key street segments and at intersections that directly serve freeways. In this manner, cut-through traffic on residential streets will be avoided, thereby slowing traffic speeds in residential neighborhoods, enhancing traffic safety, and protecting the character of neighborhoods.

5. **Riverside will be promoted as an arts, cultural, entertainment, and educational center for the Inland Empire.** The Arts and Culture Element and Education Element set forth definitive policies and approaches to enhance Riverside's status as the arts, culture, entertainment, and education center of the Inland Empire. By pursuing and implementing partnerships with the cultural and educational institutions within Riverside, the City and its partners will be able to combine physical and fiscal resources in a manner that can enhance the schools, institutions of higher learning, and arts facilities and programs. These approaches will work to improve education, heighten public support of arts and culture, create a more vibrant community, and attract visitors to Riverside to spend dollars that support the local economy.

For the reasons cited above, the City finds that the Project's adverse, unavoidable environmental impacts are outweighed by these considerable benefits.